



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,179	08/20/2003	David T. Ross	457390	5706

27717 7590 02/09/2007
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
131 S. DEARBORN ST., SUITE2400
CHICAGO, IL 60603-5803

EXAMINER

TRAN, HANH VAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3637

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/644,179

Applicant(s)

ROSS, DAVID T.

Examiner

Hanh V. Tran

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-16 and 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-16,18 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 October 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/26/2006 has been entered.

Drawings

2. The drawings were received on 10/26/2006. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 21-22 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 21, line 2, "with mounting structure" should be "with a mounting structure". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 11-14, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 5,161,870 to Mason et al.

Mason et al discloses a drawer comprising all the elements recited in the above listed claims including, such as shown in Figs 1-2, a drawer body including a bottom

Art Unit: 3637

wall 12 and a peripheral wall structure 14 extending upwardly from the bottom wall, a mounting structure, such as shown in Fig 2, on the peripheral wall structure and including a base portion projecting forwardly from the peripheral wall structure and an attachment portion 34 projecting from the base portion, a front panel 20 having an elongated panel wall having a front surface 38 and a rear surface 40, a projection 48 on the panel wall having a base portion extending rearwardly from the rear surface of the panel wall and an attachment portion integral with the base portion and extending therefrom substantially parallel to the rear surface of the panel wall for cooperation with the rear surface of the panel wall to define an open-ended channel therebetween, which channel extends the entire length of the wall; wherein the attachment portion of the mounting structure extends substantially parallel to a facing portion of the rear side of the wall, the channel extends the entire length of the wall, and the front panel is crimped to the mounting structure. Mason et al further discloses the wall including, such as shown in Fig 4, a first portion extending substantially parallel to a first plane and a second portion 54 extending substantially parallel to a second plane inclined with respect to the first plane, the projection 48 is a first projection, and further comprising a second projection on the wall and having a base portion extending rearwardly from the rear surface of the wall and an attachment portion integral with the base portion of the second projection and extending therefrom along the rear surface 40 of the wall for cooperation with the rear surface of the wall to define a second channel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason et al.

Mason et al discloses all the structural elements recited in the above listed claims as discussed in paragraph #6. The differences being that Mason et al does not disclose the method of making the drawer as recited in claims 21 and 22. However, since Mason et al discloses all the structural limitations recited therein, it would have been obvious and well within the level of one skill in the art to perform the method steps recited in claims 21-22.

9. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-15, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 2,842,420 to Hansen et al in view of USP 3,526,934 to Owen, Sr. and USP 3,160,448 to Abernathy et al.

Hansen et al discloses a drawer comprising all the elements recited in the above listed claims including, such as shown in Fig 1, a drawer body including a bottom wall and a peripheral wall structure 11-12 extending upwardly from the bottom wall, a mounting structure on the peripheral wall structure and including a base portion projecting forwardly from the peripheral wall structure and an attachment portion projecting from the base portion and extending above and below the base portion, a front panel 10 having an elongated panel wall having a front surface and a rear surface, first and second projections on the panel wall each having a base portion extending rearwardly from the rear surface of the panel wall and an attachment portion integral with the base portion and extending therefrom along the rear surface of the panel wall for cooperation with the rear surface of the panel wall to define a channel therebetween in opposite directions, the attachment portion of the mounting structure being slidably receivable in the channel of the front panel 10, the peripheral wall structure including two side walls 11-12, the mounting structure including portions projecting from each side wall 11-12; wherein the drawer pull projects forwardly of the wall and extends the entire length thereof. The different being that Hansen et al does not disclose the attachment portion of the projection extending substantially parallel to the rear surface for cooperation with the rear surface of the wall to define an open-ended channel therebetween that extends the entire length of the wall, one of the first and second projections including portions cooperating with the rear surface of the wall to define channels respectively opening in opposite direction, and the projection is substantially T-shaped in transverse cross-section.

However, Abernathy et al teaches the idea of providing an elongated wall of a drawer with a projection 11 on the wall and having a base portion extending rearwardly from the rear surface of the wall and an attachment portion integral with the base portion and extending substantially parallel to the rear surface of the wall for cooperation with the rear surface of the wall to define an open-ended channel therebetween that extends the entire length of the wall, thereby allowing easy adjustment of a panel connected to said wall. Owen, Sr. further teaches that it is well known in the art and well within the level of one skill in the art to provide interlocking means for connecting two members with either a dovetail configuration (such as shown in Fig 5) or a T-slot configuration (such as shown in Fig 9) in order to increase the versatility of the interlocking means. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the structure of Hansen by providing the rear surface of the wall with an open-ended channel that extends the entire length of the wall in order to allow easy adjustment of a panel connected to said wall, as taught by Abernathy, and modifying the dovetail configuration of Hansen et al by providing a T-slot configuration in order to increase the versatility of the interlocking means, as taught by Owen, Sr. , since the references teach alternate conventional interlocking means structure, used for the same intended purpose of connecting two members, thereby providing structure as claimed. Since the projection of Hansen et al, as modified by Abernathy and Owen, Sr., now shows a T-slot configuration, the projection includes portions cooperating with the rear surface of the wall to define channels respectively opening in opposite direction.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 23 is allowed.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument on page 10 that the L-shaped flange 48 of Mason does not have a portion extending upwardly or downwardly from the flange and parallel to the rear surface of the drawer head, the examiner takes the position that mason clearly meets the claimed limitations of a projection on the wall and having a base portion (the horizontal portion of L-shaped flange 48) extending rearwardly from the rear surface of the wall and an attachment portion (the vertical portion of L-shaped flange 48) extending substantially parallel to the rear surface of the wall.

12. In response to applicant's argument on page 10 that Mason does not disclose the drawer front defining "an open-ended channel that extends the entire length of the panel wall", the examiner takes the position that the L-shaped flange 48 of Mason clearly shows an open-ended channel (opening downwardly) that extends the entire length of the panel wall.

13. In response to applicant's argument on page 11 regarding claim 11, the examiner takes the same position as stated above that Mason clearly shows the claimed limitation of the projection having a base portion extending rearwardly from the rear surface of the panel wall and an attachment portion integral with the base portion and extending therefrom substantially parallel to the rear surface of the panel wall.

Art Unit: 3637

14. In response to applicant's argument on page 11 regarding a drawer pull of claim 2 and 10, the examiner takes the position that the claimed language fails to clearly define any structural limitation of a drawer pull, thus the bottom edge of the elongated wall is defined as the "drawer pull" which meets the claimed limitation of being unitary with the panel wall and extends the entire length thereof.

15. In response to applicant's argument on page 11 that Mason fails to disclose the limitation in claim 13 of the front panel being crimped to the mounting structure, the examiner takes the position that the term "crimped" is broad enough that the structure of Mason meets the claimed limitation.

16. In response to applicant's argument on page 11 that Mason does not disclose "a folded under portion", the examiner takes the position that the claimed language fails to provide adequate structural limitation to define what a "folded under portion" is, thus the structure of Mason meets the claimed limitation.

17. In response to applicant's argument on page 12 regarding the limitation in claim 21 that Mason does not disclose slidably inserting a mounting structure in the outer drawer head that extends across the front end of the drawer body, and that the inner drawer head of Mason pivotably attached to the outer drawer head at a center portion of the outer drawer head (not along the length of the outer drawer head), the examiner takes the position that a pivotal motion does comprise sliding movement therein, and Mason clearly meets the claimed limitation of "slidably inserting the attachment portion of the mounting structure in the channel of the drawer panel and sliding the panel

Art Unit: 3637

therealong until the panel reaches a mounted position extending across the front end of the drawer body.”

18. Applicant's arguments with respect to Hansen and Owen have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-6868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, and alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/644,179

Page 10

Art Unit: 3637

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hanh V. Tran', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

HVT

February 5, 2007

Hanh V. Tran

Art Unit 3637